

Staggered chiral perturbation theory in the two-flavor case

Xining Du

Department of Physics, Washington University, St.Louis, Missouri, USA

Abstract

I study two-flavor staggered chiral perturbation theory in the light pseudoscalar sector. The pion mass and decay constant are calculated through NLO in the partially-quenched case. In the limit where the strange quark mass is large compared to the light quark masses and the taste splittings, I show that the SU(2) staggered chiral theory emerges from the SU(3) staggered chiral theory, as expected. Explicit relations between SU(2) and SU(3) low energy constants and taste-violating parameters are given. The results are useful for SU(2) chiral fits to asqtad data and allow one to incorporate effects from varying strange quark masses.

I. INTRODUCTION

Chiral perturbation theory (χ PT) [1–3] has proved to be a very important tool for lattice QCD simulations. By using χ PT, one can extrapolate physical quantities to physical light quark masses as well as getting information on low energy constants (LECs) in the chiral theory. Nowadays many lattice simulations use 2+1 flavor dynamical quarks, and SU(3) χ PT is often used for the chiral analysis. However, SU(2) χ PT is of interest for the following reasons:

- The strange quark mass in lattice simulations is usually very close to its physical value, while light quark masses are significantly smaller. Hence we expect that SU(2) χ PT converges faster than SU(3) χ PT and serves as a better approximation.
- By fitting lattice data to SU(2) χ PT formulae, one can extract information about SU(2) LECs directly and compare them with results from phenomenological analysis.
- By comparing results from SU(2) and SU(3) chiral fits, we can study the systematic errors resulting from the truncations of each version of χ PT.

The use of SU(2) χ PT for chiral fits to data from three-flavor simulations has been advocated by several groups recently [4, 5]; see also the review by Lellouch [6] and references therein.

For lattice QCD formulated with (rooted) staggered fermions, rooted staggered chiral perturbation theory (rS χ PT) [7–10] is the corresponding effective field theory (EFT), which incorporates taste-violating effects systematically. The partially-quenched version, PQ-rS χ PT, was used by the MILC collaboration in the SU(3) chiral analysis of lattice data generated with 2+1 asqtad fermions. This was done at NLO systematically by using 1-loop chiral logarithms from SU(3) PQ-rS χ PT plus higher order analytic terms [11]. Recently, a systematic NNLO analysis [12] was performed with continuum NNLO chiral logarithms. Results from this work give strong evidence for the validity of rS χ PT as the EFT for QCD formulated with rooted staggered quarks.

In order to perform the corresponding analysis in the SU(2) case, one needs to calculate the 1-loop formulae for pseudoscalar meson masses and decay constants in two-flavor PQ-rS χ PT. In addition, it is important to check that the presence of taste violations and rooting do not interfere with the decoupling of the strange quark as its mass is increased, allowing the SU(2) chiral theory to emerge from the SU(3) theory. This is a check on a technical

step in the argument of Ref. [9] that rS χ PT is the correct effective chiral theory for rooted staggered quarks. Finally, it is useful to relate the LECs in the two-flavor and three-flavor cases, and to find the scale dependence of the LECs in both cases, thereby checking their consistency. These calculations are presented below.

II. TWO-FLAVOR PARTIALLY-QUENCHED rS χ PT

A. Brief review of S χ PT

The key point of S χ PT is to incorporate systematically the taste-violating effects at finite lattice spacing in the chiral perturbation theory for staggered fermions. The idea of how to develop χ PT including scaling violations is due to Sharpe and Singleton [13], and was first applied to staggered quarks by Lee and Sharpe [8].

Basically, S χ PT is constructed through two steps. First, one writes down the continuum Symanzik Effective Theory (SET) for staggered fermions. The taste-violating four-quark operators appear at $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$ in the SET. The coefficient of each of these operators also depends on the coupling constant α_s , and it varies with different staggered actions used in simulations. Specifically, for unimproved staggered action, these operators appear at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s a^2)$, while for asqtad improved action, these operators appear at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2 a^2)$ [11]. For Highly Improved Staggered Quarks (HISQ), these operators also appear at $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2 a^2)$ but with smaller coefficients than for asqtad quarks [14, 15]. In the second step, one maps operators in the SET to terms in the chiral Lagrangian using spurion analysis. The taste-violating four quark operators are mapped into the taste-breaking potential in the chiral Lagrangian. In the two-flavor case, these two steps can be done in the same manner as those in the three-flavor case given by Refs. [7]. The final form of the two-flavor chiral Lagrangian looks exactly the same as the three-flavor Lagrangian except that the chiral field Φ takes its definition in the two-flavor case.

For the purposes of constructing the chiral theory, the SET is taken as “given”. We do not need to consider the issues of additive and multiplicative renormalizations that one would need to face in defining finite higher dimensional operators in perturbation theory. All we need to know are the symmetry properties of staggered fermions, which determine what operators can appear. Note further that the lattice spacing a is not a cutoff for the chiral

theory, which will in practice be cut off using dimensional regularization. Instead a serves to parameterize symmetry breaking in the chiral theory, and plays a role closely analogous to that of the light quark masses.

In the SET there are also operators at $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$ which satisfy all the continuum symmetries of staggered fermions. Such operators produce “generic” discretization effects and in general come with different powers of α_s than taste-violations. (For example, with asqtad quarks, the lowest order of generic discretization corrections is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s a^2)$ while the lowest order of taste-violations is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^2 a^2)$.) These operators in the SET are logically distinct from $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$ taste-violating operators, and their sizes are “dialed” more or less independently by adjustments of the actions. In the asqtad case, it is known from simulations [11] that taste violating effects are the dominant cause of discretization effects at $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$ even though generic effects can appear at lower order in α_s . That is because the coefficients of the taste-violating operators turn out to be large. After being mapped to chiral theory, the generic SET operators give the same terms as those in the continuum Lagrangian, but multiplied by a coefficient of $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$. For the same reason above, these terms in the chiral Lagrangian representing generic discretization effects are essentially different from the taste-violating terms even though both of them can appear at the same order of lattice spacing a . It is therefore consistent to consider the effects of taste-violating operators independently of generic effects, and that is what I do here.

In practical numerical work, both effects need to be considered. The fact that taste-violations and generic finite lattice spacing effect usually are significantly small, have different mass dependence, and come with different powers of α_s allows a relatively clean separations if sufficient numbers of different lattice spacings are included. Of course, some systematic error will be present and needs to be estimated.

For convenience in numerical work, the effects of generic operators are often absorbed into effective a^2 dependence of the LECs. This is possible since the generic operators have the same symmetries as the continuum QCD operators.¹ So, for example, one can take the results given here for SU(2) SXPT and effectively take into account generic operators simply by letting the LECs have a^2 dependence. But I emphasize that, logically, the generic effects should be thought of in χ PPT as new operators, just like the taste-violating effects, not as

¹ There are also operators that have continuum taste symmetry but violate rotational invariance. Their effects appear only at $\mathcal{O}(a^4)$ in the χ PPT for pseudoscalar mesons.

corrections to old operators. That way, we satisfy the requirement that all LECs in SXPT are a^2 independent, just as they are independent of the light quark masses.

B. Two-flavor PQ-SXPT at LO

In SXPT the theory becomes a joint expansion about the chiral and continuum limits. The effective Lagrangian was worked out for the single flavor case in Ref. [8], and later generalized to multi-flavor case in Ref. [7]. In Refs. [9, 10], it was shown that the replica method introduced for this problem in Ref. [16] is a valid method for taking rooting into account. The partial quenching can be treated either by the graded symmetry method [17, 18], or by the replica method [19]. Here, for simplicity, I use the replica method for both the rooting and the partial quenching. I take n'_r copies of each valence quark (x,y), and n_r copies of each flavor of sea quark (u,d). The chiral symmetry group is $SU(8(n'_r + n_r))_L \times SU(8(n'_r + n_r))_R$. The pseudoscalar mesons can now be collected into a $8(n'_r + n_r) \times 8(n'_r + n_r)$ matrix Φ , where the factors of 8 arise from 2 flavors of 4 tastes each:

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} X^{11} & \dots & X^{1n'_r} & P_+^{11} & \dots & P_+^{1n'_r} & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ X^{n'_r 1} & \dots & X^{n'_r n'_r} & P_+^{n'_r 1} & \dots & P_+^{n'_r n'_r} & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ P_-^{11} & \dots & P_-^{1n'_r} & Y^{11} & \dots & Y^{1n'_r} & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ P_-^{n'_r 1} & \dots & P_-^{n'_r n'_r} & Y^{n'_r 1} & \dots & Y^{n'_r n'_r} & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & U^{11} & \dots & U^{1n_r} & \pi_+^{11} & \dots & \pi_+^{1n_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & U^{n_r 1} & \dots & U^{n_r n_r} & \pi_+^{n_r 1} & \dots & \pi_+^{n_r n_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \pi_-^{11} & \dots & \pi_-^{1n_r} & D^{11} & \dots & D^{1n_r} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \pi_-^{n_r 1} & \dots & \pi_-^{n_r n_r} & D^{n_r 1} & \dots & D^{n_r n_r} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where each entry is a 4×4 matrix in taste space with, for example, $U^{ij} = \sum_{a=1}^{16} U_a^{ij} T_a$. X, Y, U , and D are the mesons made from $x\bar{x}, y\bar{y}, u\bar{u}$, and $d\bar{d}$ quarks respectively. P_+ is a charged valence meson made from $x\bar{y}$ and π_+ is the charged sea meson made from $u\bar{d}$. The

hermitian generators T_a are defined to be:

$$T_a = \{\xi_5, i\xi_{\mu 5}, i\xi_{\mu\nu}, \xi_\mu, \xi_I\}. \quad (2)$$

The lowest order ($\mathcal{O}(p^2, m_q, a^2)$) Euclidean Lagrangian is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(2)} = & \frac{f_{(2)}^2}{8} \text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger) - \frac{f_{(2)}^2}{8} \text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger + \chi \Sigma) \\ & + \frac{2m_0^2}{3} (U_I^{11} + \dots + U_I^{n_r n_r} + D_I^{11} + \dots + D_I^{n_r n_r})^2 + a^2 \mathcal{V}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\Sigma = \exp(i\Phi/f)$ and χ is a $8(n'_r + n_r) \times 8(n'_r + n_r)$ diagonal matrix:

$$\chi = 2\mu_{(2)} \text{Diag}(\underbrace{m_x I, \dots, m_x I}_{n'_r}, \underbrace{m_y I, \dots, m_y I}_{n'_r}, \underbrace{m_u I, \dots, m_u I}_{n_r}, \underbrace{m_d I, \dots, m_d I}_{n_r}) \quad (4)$$

with I the 4×4 identity matrix in taste space. The covariant derivative D_μ in Eq. (3) is defined by

$$D_\mu \Sigma = \partial_\mu \Sigma - i l_\mu \Sigma + i \Sigma r_\mu, \quad D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger = \partial_\mu \Sigma^\dagger - i r_\mu \Sigma^\dagger + i \Sigma^\dagger l_\mu, \quad (5)$$

where l_μ and r_μ are the left and right-handed currents respectively. Throughout this paper, I always use the superscript or subscript “(2)” to indicate parameters in the two-flavor theory.

The taste-breaking potential $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U} + \mathcal{U}'$ is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{U} \equiv \sum_k C_k \mathcal{O}_k = & C_1^{(2)} \text{Tr}(\xi_5^{(R)} \Sigma \xi_5^{(R)} \Sigma^\dagger) \\ & + C_3^{(2)} \frac{1}{2} \sum_\nu [\text{Tr}(\xi_\nu^{(R)} \Sigma \xi_\nu^{(R)} \Sigma) + h.c.] \\ & + C_4^{(2)} \frac{1}{4} \sum_\nu [\text{Tr}(\xi_{\nu 5}^{(R)} \Sigma \xi_{5\nu}^{(R)} \Sigma) + h.c.] \\ & + C_6^{(2)} \sum_{\mu < \nu} \text{Tr}(\xi_{\mu\nu}^{(R)} \Sigma \xi_{\nu\mu}^{(R)} \Sigma^\dagger), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{U}' \equiv \sum_{k'} C_{k'} \mathcal{O}_{k'} = & C_{2V}^{(2)} \frac{1}{4} \sum_\nu [\text{Tr}(\xi_\nu^{(R)} \Sigma) \text{Tr}(\xi_\nu^{(R)} \Sigma) + h.c.] \\ & + C_{2A}^{(2)} \frac{1}{4} \sum_\nu [\text{Tr}(\xi_{\nu 5}^{(R)} \Sigma) \text{Tr}(\xi_{5\nu}^{(R)} \Sigma) + h.c.] \\ & + C_{5V}^{(2)} \frac{1}{2} \sum_\nu [\text{Tr}(\xi_\nu^{(R)} \Sigma) \text{Tr}(\xi_\nu^{(R)} \Sigma^\dagger)] \\ & + C_{5A}^{(2)} \frac{1}{2} \sum_\nu [\text{Tr}(\xi_{\nu 5}^{(R)} \Sigma) \text{Tr}(\xi_{5\nu}^{(R)} \Sigma^\dagger)], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\xi_5^{(R)}$ is the product of ξ_5 in taste space with the identity matrix in flavor and replica space, and similarly for $\xi_\nu^{(R)}$, $\xi_{\nu 5}^{(R)}$ and $\xi_{\mu\nu}^{(R)}$.

Due to the anomaly, the $SU(8(n'_r + n_r))$ singlet receives a large contribution to its mass ($\propto m_0$), and thus does not play a dynamical role. Integrating out this singlet is equivalent to keeping the singlet explicitly in the Lagrangian (the third term in $\mathcal{L}^{(2)}$), and taking $m_0 \rightarrow \infty$ at the end of the calculation [20]. Here, the m_0^2 term is normalized so that for the hairpin diagram between two flavor-neutral taste singlet mesons, each composed of a single species, the vertex is $\frac{4m_0^2}{3}$, independent of the number of flavors. For the two-flavor SXPT with n_r replicas for each sea quark, the mass matrix for flavor-neutral taste singlet mesons takes the form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_{U_I^{11}} + \delta' & \delta' & \delta' & \delta' & \dots & \delta' \\ \delta' & \ddots & \delta' & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \delta' & \dots & m_{U_I^{n_r n_r}} + \delta' & \delta' & \dots & \delta' \\ \delta' & \dots & \delta' & m_{D_I^{11}} + \delta' & \delta' & \delta' \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \delta' & \ddots & \delta' \\ \delta' & \dots & \delta' & \delta' & \delta' & m_{D_I^{n_r n_r}} + \delta' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where every non-diagonal element is $\delta' \equiv \frac{4m_0^2}{3}$, and I have anticipated taking $n'_r \rightarrow 0$ to eliminate virtual loops of valence quarks. Diagonalizing the matrix and taking the limit of $m_0 \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain the mass of the η'_I :

$$m_{\eta'_I}^2 = \frac{8m_0^2}{3} n_r. \quad (9)$$

Generally, if there are N_f flavors of sea quarks, the result will be $\frac{4m_0^2}{3} N_f n_r$.

C. Two-flavor PQ-rSXPT at NLO

At NLO, the two-flavor PQ-rSXPT Lagrangian has two parts:

$$\mathcal{L}^{(4)} = \mathcal{L}_{cont}^{(4)} + \mathcal{L}_{t-v}^{(4)}. \quad (10)$$

$\mathcal{L}_{cont}^{(4)}$ contains operators of $\mathcal{O}(p^4, p^2 m_q, m_q^2)$, which are of the same form as operators in two-flavor continuum PQ- χ PT. $\mathcal{L}_{t-v}^{(4)}$ is of $\mathcal{O}(a^2 p^2, a^2 m_q, a^4)$. It contains all NLO taste-violating terms for staggered fermions [21].

The most general continuum NLO Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{cont}^{(4)}$ in Euclidean space can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{cont}^{(4)} = & -\frac{l_1^0}{4}[\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma)]^2 - \frac{l_2^0}{4}\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma)\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma) \\
& + p_3^0 \left(\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma D_\nu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma) - \frac{1}{2}[\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma)]^2 \right) \\
& + p_4^0 \left(\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma) + 2\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma D_\nu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma) \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{1}{2}[\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma)]^2 - \text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma)\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma) \right) \\
& - \frac{l_3^0 + l_4^0}{16}[\text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger + \Sigma \chi^\dagger)]^2 + \frac{l_4^0}{8}\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma)\text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger + \Sigma \chi^\dagger) \\
& + \frac{p_1^0}{16} \left(\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma(\chi \Sigma^\dagger + \Sigma \chi^\dagger)) - \frac{1}{2}\text{Tr}(D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\mu \Sigma)\text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger + \Sigma \chi^\dagger) \right) \\
& + \frac{p_2^0}{16} \left(2\text{Tr}(\Sigma^\dagger \chi \Sigma^\dagger \chi + \Sigma \chi^\dagger \Sigma \chi^\dagger) - \text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger + \Sigma \chi^\dagger)^2 - \text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger - \Sigma \chi^\dagger)^2 \right) \\
& + \frac{l_7^0}{16}[\text{Tr}(\chi \Sigma^\dagger - \Sigma \chi^\dagger)]^2 \\
& - l_5^0 \text{Tr}(\Sigma^\dagger F_{R\mu\nu} \Sigma F_{L\mu\nu}) - \frac{i l_6^0}{2} \text{Tr}(F_{L\mu\nu} D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D_\nu \Sigma + F_{R\mu\nu} D_\mu \Sigma D_\nu \Sigma^\dagger) \\
& + \text{contact terms},
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

It is written in this form so that the bare coefficients l_i^0 ($i = 1, 2, \dots, 7$) have the same values as the corresponding l_i with the standard definitions [3] in the two-flavor full QCD limit. The parameters p_1^0 , p_2^0 , p_3^0 and p_4^0 are the four extra LECs at NLO in the partially-quenched case. The four operators associated with p_i^0 are unphysical operators at $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$, which only appear in the two-flavor partially-quenched theory. These unphysical operators vanish in the unquenched SU(2) sector of the PQ theory as a result of the Cayley-Hamilton relations for 2-dimensional matrices. Among these operators, the two with factors p_1^0 and p_2^0 will contribute to the pion masses and decay constants at NLO. The other two with factors p_3^0 and p_4^0 only contribute to the same quantities at NNLO, since they contain four derivatives. Here, I am only interested in pion masses and decay constants at NLO, so p_1^0 and p_2^0 will enter the calculations below, and p_3^0 and p_4^0 are irrelevant.

This set of LECs can be related to the LECs used by Bijens and Lähde [22] through:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_3^0 &= -L_3^{(2pq)} + 2L_0^{(2pq)}, & p_4^0 &= -L_0^{(2pq)}, \\
l_1^0 &= 4L_1^{(2pq)} + 2L_3^{(2pq)} - 2L_0^{(2pq)}, & l_2^0 &= 4L_2^{(2pq)} + 4L_0^{(2pq)}, \\
p_1^0 &= 16L_5^{(2pq)}, & p_2^0 &= -8L_8^{(2pq)}, \\
l_3^0 &= 16L_6^{(2pq)} + 8L_8^{(2pq)} - 8L_4^{(2pq)} - 4L_5^{(2pq)}, & l_4^0 &= 8L_4^{(2pq)} + 4L_5^{(2pq)}, \\
l_5^0 &= L_{10}^{(2pq)}, & l_6^0 &= -2L_9^{(2pq)}, \\
l_7^0 &= -16L_7^{(2pq)} - 8L_8^{(2pq)}. & &
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

The general form of $\mathcal{L}_{t-v}^{(4)}(\mathcal{O}(a^2p^2, a^2m_q, a^4))$ is given in Ref. [21]. Examples of operators in $\mathcal{L}_{t-v}^{(4)}$ that contribute here are:

$$a^2\text{Tr}(\partial_\mu\Sigma^\dagger\xi_5\partial_\mu\Sigma\xi_5), \quad a^2\text{Tr}(\xi_\mu\Sigma^\dagger\xi_\mu\chi^\dagger) + p.c., \tag{13}$$

(with *p.c.* indicating parity conjugate) where the first operator contributes both to pseudo-Goldstone masses and decay constants at NLO, and the second one only contributes to the pseudo-Goldstone masses at NLO. From this, it is clear that the taste-violating analytic contributions to decay constants and masses at NLO are independent. We do not need any further details from Ref. [21] here, since it is not currently useful to relate the NLO analytic taste-violating contributions to parameters in the Lagrangian.

D. Rooting and partial quenching

In the continuum limit, there are four degenerate taste species for each quark flavor. We obtain physical results in rSXPT by taking the fourth root of each fermion determinant, which is known as the fourth root procedure. Although it has been shown that this procedure produces, non-perturbatively, violations of locality at non-zero lattice spacing [23], work over the last few years indicates that locality and universality are restored in the continuum limit of the lattice theory [24, 25], and that rSXPT is the correct chiral effective theory [9, 10], thereby reproducing continuum χ PT in the $a \rightarrow 0$ limit. For a recent review of the fourth-root procedure see Ref. [26] and references therein.

For calculations in rSXPT, the fourth-root is taken by letting $n_r \rightarrow \frac{1}{4}$ at the end of the calculation [9, 10]. Similarly, virtual loops associated with the valence quarks are eliminated by taking $n_r' \rightarrow 0$ [19].

III. PION MASS AND DECAY CONSTANT

Following the procedures in Ref. [7], I calculate the light pseudoscalar mass and decay constant through NLO ($\mathcal{O}(m_q^2, m_q a^2)$). For simplicity, I always assume the up and down quark masses are equal, $m_u = m_d = m_l$. The dimensional regularization scheme is employed, and the results in $d = 4 - \epsilon$ dimensional space-time are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{m_{P_5^+}^2}{(m_x + m_y)} = & \mu_{(2)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^{d-4} 16 \pi^2 f_{(2)}^2} \left[\sum_j R_j^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_j^2 (m_j^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \right. \right. \\
& - 2a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)} \sum_j R_j^{[3,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_V}^{[3]}\}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_j^2 (m_j^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} + (V \leftrightarrow A) + a^2 (\tilde{L}_{(2)}''^0 + \tilde{L}_{(2)}'^0) \Big] \\
& + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{\Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (4l_3^0 + p_1^0 + 4p_2^0)(2m_l) + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{\Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (-p_1^0 - 4p_2^0)(m_x + m_y) \Big\}, \quad (14) \\
f_{P_5^+} = & f_{(2)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{\Lambda^{d-4} 16 \pi^2 f_{(2)}^2} \left[-\frac{1}{32} \sum_{Q,B} \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_{Q_B}^2 (m_{Q_B}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \right. \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \left(\mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_{X_I}^2 (m_{X_I}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} + \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_{Y_I}^2 (m_{Y_I}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \right. \\
& + (m_{U_I}^2 - m_{X_I}^2)(-\mathcal{R}_\epsilon - 1)(m_{X_I}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} + (m_{U_I}^2 - m_{Y_I}^2)(-\mathcal{R}_\epsilon - 1)(m_{Y_I}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \left(R_{X_I}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_{X_I}^2 (m_{X_I}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} + R_{Y_I}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_{Y_I}^2 (m_{Y_I}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \right) \\
& + \frac{a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)}}{2} \left(R_{X_V}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\}) (-\mathcal{R}_\epsilon - 1)(m_{X_V}^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} + \sum_j D_{j,X_V}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_j^2 (m_j^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \right. \\
& + (X \leftrightarrow Y) + 2 \sum_j R_j^{[3,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_V}^{[3]}\}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon m_j^2 (m_j^2)^{-\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \Big) + (V \leftrightarrow A) \\
& \left. + a^2 (\tilde{L}_{(2)}''^0 - \tilde{L}_{(2)}'^0) \right] + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2 \Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (4l_4^0 - p_1^0)(2m_l) + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2 \Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (p_1^0)(m_x + m_y) \Big\}, \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

where Λ is the scale introduced in the dimensional regularization, and all the scale factors are written explicitly. Here, $\mathcal{R}_\epsilon$ is defined to be:

$$\mathcal{R}_\epsilon = -\frac{2}{\epsilon} - \log(4\pi) + \gamma - 1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon), \quad (16)$$

where $\gamma = -\Gamma'(1)$ is Euler's constant. In Eqs. (14) and (15), $\mathcal{R}_\epsilon$ comes from the integral over the tadpole diagram with a single pole, while $(-\mathcal{R}_\epsilon - 1)$ comes from the integral over the tadpole diagram with a double pole. The index Q runs over the 4 mesons made from one valence and one sea quark, and B runs over the 16 tastes, which form five multiplets (P, V, A, T, I). $\delta_V'^{(2)}$ and $\delta_A'^{(2)}$ are LO taste-violating hairpin parameters, and $L_{(2)}''^0$ and $L_{(2)}'^0$

are NLO taste-violating parameters. The latter are simply the linear combinations of LECs coming from $\mathcal{O}(a^2 p^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(a^2 m_q)$ taste-violating terms, for example, the operators given in Eq. (13). There are no contributions from $\mathcal{O}(a^4)$ terms to pseudo-Goldstone masses and decay constants, either because of the exact non-singlet chiral symmetry (for the masses) or because the operators do not contain derivatives (for the decay constant).

The residue functions R and D are defined as in the SU(3) case [7]:

$$R_j^{[n,k]}(\{M\}; \{\mu\}) \equiv \frac{\prod_{a=1}^k (\mu_a^2 - m_j^2)}{\prod'_{l=1}^n (m_l^2 - m_j^2)}, \quad (17)$$

$$D_{j,i}^{[n,k]}(\{M\}; \{\mu\}) \equiv -\frac{d}{dm_i^2} R_j^{[n,k]}(\{M\}; \{\mu\}), \quad (18)$$

where the prime on the product means that $l = j$ is omitted. The denominator mass-set arguments in Eqs. (17) and (18) are defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\} &\equiv \{m_{X_V}, m_{\eta'_V}\}, & \{\mathcal{M}_{Y_V}^{[2]}\} &\equiv \{m_{Y_V}, m_{\eta'_V}\}, \\ \{\mathcal{M}_{X_{Y_I}}^{[2]}\} &\equiv \{m_{X_I}, m_{Y_I}\}, & \{\mathcal{M}_{X_{Y_V}}^{[3]}\} &\equiv \{m_{X_V}, m_{Y_V}, m_{\eta'_V}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The numerator mass-set arguments for taste Ξ are always $\{\mu_\Xi\} \equiv \{m_{U_\Xi}\}$. We show the masses explicitly here:

$$m_{\pi_B}^2 = m_{U_B}^2 = m_{D_B}^2 = 2\mu_{(2)}m_l + a^2\Delta_B^{(2)}, \quad (20)$$

$$m_{X_B}^2 = 2\mu_{(2)}m_x + a^2\Delta_B^{(2)}, \quad (21)$$

$$m_{Y_B}^2 = 2\mu_{(2)}m_y + a^2\Delta_B^{(2)}, \quad (22)$$

$$m_{\eta'_V}^2 = m_{U_V}^2 + \frac{a^2\delta_V'^{(2)}}{2}, \quad (23)$$

$$m_{\eta'_A}^2 = m_{U_A}^2 + \frac{a^2\delta_A'^{(2)}}{2}, \quad (24)$$

$$m_{\eta'_I}^2 \sim \frac{2}{3}m_0^2, \quad (25)$$

where $\Delta_B^{(2)}$ are the taste splittings in SU(2) rSXPT. The final relation holds for $m_0^2 \gg m_{\pi_I}^2$. Here, η'_V and η'_A are, respectively, the taste-vector and taste-axial vector, flavor and replica neutral mesons whose masses are shifted by the taste-violating hairpin contributions. Since η'_I has a mass proportional to m_0^2 , it decouples in the limit when m_0^2 is taken to infinity.

Using the identities of residue functions listed in the second paper of Ref. [7]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^n R_j^{[n,k]} &= \begin{cases} 1, & n = k+1; \\ 0, & n \geq k+2. \end{cases} \\
\sum_{j=1}^n R_j^{[n,k]} m_j^2 &= \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^n m_j^2 - \sum_{a=1}^k \mu_a^2, & n = k+1; \\ -1, & n = k+2; \\ 0, & n \geq k+3. \end{cases} \\
\sum_{j=1}^n D_{j,\ell}^{[n,k]} &= \begin{cases} 1, & n = k; \\ 0, & n \geq k+1. \end{cases} \\
\sum_{j=1}^n \left(D_{j,\ell}^{[n,k]} m_j^2 \right) - R_\ell^{[n,k]} &= \begin{cases} m_\ell^2 + \sum_{j=1}^n m_j^2 - \sum_{a=1}^k \mu_a^2, & n = k; \\ -1, & n = k+1; \\ 0, & n \geq k+2. \end{cases} \quad (26)
\end{aligned}$$

and ignoring terms vanishing at order ϵ or higher as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, one can simplify Eqs. (14) and (15) to:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{m_{P_5^+}^2}{(m_x + m_y)} = & \mu_{(2)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f_{(2)}^2} \left[(\mu_{(2)}(2m_x + 2m_y - 2m_l) + a^2 \Delta_I^{(2)} + 2a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)} + 2a^2 \delta_A'^{(2)}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \right. \right. \\
& + \sum_j R_j^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) l(m_j^2) - 2a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)} \sum_j R_j^{[3,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_V}^{[3]}\}) l(m_j^2) + (V \leftrightarrow A) \\
& + \Lambda^{d-4} a^2 (\tilde{L}_{(2)}''^0 + \tilde{L}_{(2)}'^0) \Big] \\
& + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{\Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (4l_3^0 + p_1^0 + 4p_2^0)(2m_l) + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{\Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (-p_1^0 - 4p_2^0)(m_x + m_y) \Big\}, \quad (27) \\
f_{P_5^+} = & f_{(2)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f_{(2)}^2} \left[-(\mu_{(2)}(m_x + m_y + 2m_l) + 2a^2 \Delta_{av}^{(2)} + 2a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)} + 2a^2 \delta_A'^{(2)}) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \right. \right. \\
& - \frac{1}{32} \sum_{Q,B} l(m_{Q_B}^2) + \frac{1}{4} \left(l(m_{X_I}^2) + l(m_{Y_I}^2) + (m_{U_I}^2 - m_{X_I}^2) \tilde{l}(m_{X_I}^2) \right. \\
& + (m_{U_I}^2 - m_{Y_I}^2) \tilde{l}(m_{Y_I}^2) \Big) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_j R_{m_j}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) l(m_j^2) \\
& + \frac{a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)}}{2} \left(R_{X_V}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\}) \tilde{l}(m_{X_V}^2) + \sum_j D_{j,X_V}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\}) l(m_j^2) \right. \\
& + (X \leftrightarrow Y) + 2 \sum_j R_j^{[3,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_V}^{[3]}\}) l(m_j^2) \Big) + (V \leftrightarrow A) \\
& + \Lambda^{d-4} a^2 (\tilde{L}_{(2)}''^0 - \tilde{L}_{(2)}'^0) \Big] + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2\Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (4l_4^0 - p_1^0)(2m_l) + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2\Lambda^{d-4} f_{(2)}^2} (p_1^0)(m_x + m_y) \Big\}, \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta_{av}^{(2)} \equiv \frac{1}{16} (\Delta_5^{(2)} + 4\Delta_V^{(2)} + 6\Delta_T^{(2)} + 4\Delta_A^{(2)} + \Delta_I^{(2)}) \quad (29)$$

is the average taste splitting in the two-flavor case. The chiral logarithm functions l and $\tilde{l}$ in Eqs. (27) and (28) are given by [7]:

$$l(m^2) \equiv m^2 \ln \frac{m^2}{\Lambda^2} \quad [\text{infinite volume}], \quad (30)$$

$$\tilde{l}(m^2) \equiv - \left(\ln \frac{m^2}{\Lambda^2} + 1 \right) \quad [\text{infinite volume}]. \quad (31)$$

Finite volume corrections at NLO may be incorporated by adjusting $l(m^2)$ and $\tilde{l}(m^2)$ as in Ref. [7, 27].

Recall that in continuum SU(2) χ Pt, because the NLO Lagrangian contains all the possible analytic terms consistent with the symmetries, the divergences generated from one-loop graphs built from LO vertices can be absorbed by an appropriate renormalization of

the bare NLO LECs l_i^0 and contact term coefficients h_i^0 [3]:

$$l_i^0 = (\Lambda)^{d-4} (l_i + \gamma_i \frac{\mathcal{R}_\epsilon}{32\pi^2}), \quad i = 1, \dots, 7, \quad (32)$$

$$h_i^0 = (\Lambda)^{d-4} (h_i + \delta_i \frac{\mathcal{R}_\epsilon}{32\pi^2}), \quad h = 1, 2, 3, \quad (33)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_\epsilon$ has the same definition as above, and l_i and h_i are renormalized coefficients (which often appear as l_i^r and h_i^r in literature). For SU(2) χ Pt, the values of γ_i and δ_i are listed in Ref. [3]. For the general case in SU(N) χ Pt, similar results can be found in Ref. [28]. In Eqs. (32) and (33), as one changes the scale Λ , l_i and h_i should also change in such a way that the bare quantities l_i^0 and h_i^0 are scale independent. Specifically, under a change in the chiral scale Λ to Λ' , the SU(2) LECs change by:

$$l_i(\Lambda') = l_i(\Lambda) - \frac{\gamma_i}{32\pi^2} \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad (34)$$

This renormalization procedure can be applied in SU(2) rSXPT in the same way. The only difference is that, at each order of chiral expansion, there are additional taste-violating terms. The presence of these terms in effective field theory reflects the fact that the continuum SU(4) taste symmetry is broken by finite lattice spacing effects. In the two-flavor case, the full chiral symmetry $SU_L(8) \times SU_R(8)$ is broken both by taste-violating terms and by the usual mass terms. Effectively, the taste-violating terms are acting just like the mass terms, and they can be treated in the same way once the power counting scheme is specified. In practice, we use the power counting rule $p^2 \sim m_q \sim a^2$ in SU(2) rSXPT [7, 26]. As a result, the LO contribution for a physical quantity is at $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$, $\mathcal{O}(m_q)$ and $\mathcal{O}(a^2)$, coming from the terms in Eq. (3). At NLO, the one-loop graphs built from LO vertices will generate divergences at $\mathcal{O}(p^4)$, $\mathcal{O}(p^2 m_q)$, $\mathcal{O}(m_q^2)$, $\mathcal{O}(a^2 p^2)$, $\mathcal{O}(a^2 m_q)$ and $\mathcal{O}(a^4)$. By construction, Eq. (10) is the most general Lagrangian in the same order which satisfies all the symmetries of staggered quarks. Indeed, all possible terms in this Lagrangian are found by treating mass terms and taste-violating terms in the same footing, using a spurion analysis [26]. Since the staggered symmetries (a subset of $SU_L(8) \times SU_R(8)$ in the two-flavor case) are not violated by dimensional regularization, it is possible to absorb all the one-loop divergences by renormalization of the NLO LECs in $\mathcal{L}_{cont}^{(4)}$ and NLO taste-violating parameters in $\mathcal{L}_{t-v}^{(4)}$. This is indeed the case in current calculations of the pseudo-Goldstone pion mass and decay constant. However, since I am only concentrating on these two physical quantities,

I can only derive the renormalization conditions for certain linear combinations of LECs and taste-violating parameters. Since valence quark masses m_x, m_y , sea quark mass m_l and lattice spacing a^2 each can vary independently, one can collect the coefficients for each term separately and obtain the following renormalizations:

$$l_3^0 = \Lambda^{d-4} \left(l_3 - \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \right), \quad (35)$$

$$l_4^0 = \Lambda^{d-4} \left(l_4 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \right), \quad (36)$$

$$p_1^0 = \Lambda^{d-4} \left(p_1 + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \mathcal{R}_\epsilon \right), \quad (37)$$

$$p_2^0 = \Lambda^{d-4} p_2, \quad (38)$$

$$(\tilde{L}_{(2)}''^0 + \tilde{L}_{(2)}'^0) = \Lambda^{d-4} (\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' + \tilde{L}_{(2)}' - (\Delta_I + 2\delta'_V + 2\delta'_A) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon), \quad (39)$$

$$(\tilde{L}_{(2)}''^0 - \tilde{L}_{(2)}'^0) = \Lambda^{d-4} (\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' - \tilde{L}_{(2)}' + 2(\Delta_{av} + \delta'_V + \delta'_A) \mathcal{R}_\epsilon), \quad (40)$$

Again, the renormalized coupling constants in SU(2) S χ PT are scale dependent. They should change with the scale Λ in such a way that the bare coefficients are scale independent. It is easily seen from Eqs. (35)-(40) that, under a change in the chiral scale Λ to Λ' , the LECs change by:

$$l_3(\Lambda') = l_3(\Lambda) + \frac{1}{64\pi^2} \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad (41)$$

$$l_4(\Lambda') = l_4(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad (42)$$

$$p_1(\Lambda') = p_1(\Lambda) - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad (43)$$

$$p_2(\Lambda') = p_2(\Lambda), \quad (44)$$

$$(\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' + \tilde{L}_{(2)}')(\Lambda') = (\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' + \tilde{L}_{(2)}')(\Lambda) + (\Delta_I + 2\delta'_V + 2\delta'_A) \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}, \quad (45)$$

$$(\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' - \tilde{L}_{(2)}')(\Lambda') = (\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' - \tilde{L}_{(2)}')(\Lambda) - 2(\Delta_{av} + \delta'_V + \delta'_A) \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}. \quad (46)$$

After the renormalizations in Eq. (35) through Eq. (40), the pion mass and decay constant

can be written in terms of renormalized LECs and taste-violating parameters:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{m_{P_5^+}^2}{(m_x + m_y)} = & \mu_{(2)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f_{(2)}^2} \left[\sum_j R_j^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) l(m_j^2) \right. \right. \\
& - 2a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)} \sum_j R_j^{[3,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_V}^{[3]}\}) l(m_j^2) + (V \leftrightarrow A) + a^2(\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' + \tilde{L}_{(2)}') \Big] \\
& + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{f_{(2)}^2} (4l_3 + p_1 + 4p_2)(m_u + m_d) + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{f_{(2)}^2} (-p_1 - 4p_2)(m_x + m_y) \Big\}, \quad (47) \\
f_{P_5^+} = & f_{(2)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f_{(2)}^2} \left[-\frac{1}{32} \sum_{Q,B} l(m_{Q_B}^2) \right. \right. \\
& + \frac{1}{4} \left(l(m_{X_I}^2) + l(m_{Y_I}^2) + (m_{U_I}^2 - m_{X_I}^2) \tilde{l}(m_{X_I}^2) + (m_{U_I}^2 - m_{Y_I}^2) \tilde{l}(m_{Y_I}^2) \right) \\
& - \frac{1}{2} \left(R_{X_I}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) l(m_{X_I}^2) + R_{Y_I}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_I}^{[2]}\}) l(m_{Y_I}^2) \right) \\
& + \frac{a^2 \delta_V'^{(2)}}{2} \left(R_{X_V}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\}) \tilde{l}(m_{X_V}^2) + \sum_j D_{j,X_V}^{[2,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{X_V}^{[2]}\}) l(m_j^2) \right. \\
& + (X \leftrightarrow Y) + 2 \sum_j R_j^{[3,1]}(\{\mathcal{M}_{XY_V}^{[3]}\}) l(m_j^2) \Big) + (V \leftrightarrow A) \\
& \left. + a^2(\tilde{L}_{(2)}'' - \tilde{L}_{(2)}') \right] + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2f_{(2)}^2} (4l_4 - p_1)(m_u + m_d) + \frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2f_{(2)}^2} (p_1)(m_x + m_y) \Big\}. \quad (48)
\end{aligned}$$

Now that we have the results for the pion mass and decay constant to NLO in SU(2) PQ-rS χ PT, we can study the relations of the LECs and taste-violating parameters between the two-flavor and the three-flavor cases. This can be done by comparing formulae for physical quantities in SU(2) theory and the corresponding formulae in SU(3) theory, in the case where the light quark masses and taste splittings are much smaller than the strange quark mass, *i.e.*,

$$\frac{m_x}{m_s}, \frac{m_y}{m_s}, \frac{m_l}{m_s}, \frac{a^2 \Delta_B}{\mu m_s}, \frac{a^2 \delta_{V(A)}'}{\mu m_s} \sim \epsilon \ll 1. \quad (49)$$

For small ϵ , we expect the SU(2) theory to be generated from the SU(3) one as in Ref. [2]. Since, at NLO in SU(3) χ PT, there are terms which go like $\frac{\mu m_s}{(4\pi f)^2}$ times logarithms, we will in general need to expand to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ to pick up all terms that appear at NLO in SU(2) χ PT, such as $\frac{\mu m_l}{(4\pi f)^2}$ or $\frac{a^2 \Delta_B}{(4\pi f)^2}$. Of course, all dependence on m_x, m_y, m_l and a^2 must be explicit, because the LECs do not depend on the light quark masses and have no power-law dependence on lattice spacings.

I will first focus on the taste-splittings $\Delta_B^{(2)}$ and the taste-violating hairpin parameters $\delta_{V(A)}'^{(2)}$. In Eqs. (47) and (48), $\Delta_B^{(2)}$ and $\delta_{V(A)}'^{(2)}$ only appear in the NLO part, and the same

statement is true for Δ_B and $\delta'_{V(A)}$ in the corresponding SU(3) formulae, so it suffices to use the relations between $\Delta_B^{(2)}$ and Δ_B , and $\delta'^{(2)}_{V(A)}$ and $\delta'_{V(A)}$, at LO in rSxPT.

At LO in SU(3) rSxPT, we have the mass of a flavor-nonsinglet meson:

$$m_{U_B}^2 = 2\mu m_l + a^2 \Delta_B. \quad (50)$$

By comparing with Eq. (20), we conclude that at LO, for each taste index B , we have

$$a^2 \Delta_B^{(2)} = a^2 \Delta_B. \quad (51)$$

On the other hand, the mass of η_V , the lighter of the two flavor-neutral, taste-vector mesons that mix in the SU(3) rSxPT is:

$$m_{\eta_V}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(m_{U_V}^2 + m_{S_V}^2 + \frac{3}{4} a^2 \delta'_V - Z \right), \quad (52)$$

$$Z = \sqrt{(m_{S_V}^2 - m_{U_V}^2)^2 - \frac{a^2 \delta'_V}{2} (m_{S_V}^2 - m_{U_V}^2) + \frac{9(a^2 \delta'_V)^2}{16}}. \quad (53)$$

In the limit $m_l = m_u \ll m_s$ and $a^2 \delta'_{V(A)} \ll \mu m_s$, it should become the mass of what we call η'_V here, as given in Eq. (23). Indeed, we have:

$$m_{\eta_V}^2 \xrightarrow{m_l \ll m_s} m_{U_V}^2 + \frac{1}{2} a^2 \delta'_V + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(a^2 \delta'_V)^2}{\mu m_s}\right). \quad (54)$$

Comparing Eq. (23) and Eq. (54), we find that, at LO in rSxPT,

$$a^2 \delta'^{(2)}_V = a^2 \delta'_V, \quad (55)$$

where corrections of $\mathcal{O}(\frac{(a^2 \delta'_V)^2}{\mu m_s})$ generate NLO effects in SU(2) rSxPT, since they are of $\mathcal{O}(a^4)$. A similar relation holds for $\delta'^{(2)}_A$ and δ'_A at LO:

$$a^2 \delta'^{(2)}_A = a^2 \delta'_A. \quad (56)$$

If we expand the NLO SU(3) formulae for m_π^2 and f_π in Ref. [7] in powers of ϵ , we find that the three-flavor formulae reproduce the form of the two-flavor formulae, as expected. Both are expansions in orders of $m_x, m_y, m_l, a^2 \Delta_B$ and $a^2 \delta'_{V(A)}$. Since the light valence quark masses, sea quark masses and lattice spacings can vary independently, we can match the coefficient of each term. By comparing formulae in SU(2) SxPT and SU(3) SxPT, and utilizing Eqs. (51), (55) and (56), one obtains the relations between SU(2) LECs and SU(3)

LECs up to NLO. I find:

$$f_{(2)} = f(1 - \frac{1}{16\pi^2 f^2} \mu m_s \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2} + \frac{16L_4}{f^2} \mu m_s), \quad (57)$$

$$\mu_{(2)} = \mu(1 - \frac{1}{48\pi^2 f^2} \frac{4\mu m_s}{3} \log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2} + \frac{32(2L_6 - L_4)}{f^2} \mu m_s), \quad (58)$$

$$p_1 = 16L_5 - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} (1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}), \quad (59)$$

$$p_2 = -8L_8 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{1}{6} (\log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{1}{4} (1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}), \quad (60)$$

$$l_3 = 8(2L_6 - L_4) + 4(2L_8 - L_5) - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{1}{36} (1 + \log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}), \quad (61)$$

$$l_4 = 8L_4 + 4L_5 - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \frac{1}{4} (1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}), \quad (62)$$

$$\tilde{L}''_{(2)} = \tilde{L}'' - \frac{1}{6} \Delta_I (1 + \log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) - \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{av} (1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}), \quad (63)$$

$$\tilde{L}'_{(2)} = \tilde{L}' - \frac{1}{6} \Delta_I (1 + \log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_{av} (1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}), \quad (64)$$

where L_4, L_5, L_6 and L_8 are renormalized SU(3) LECs, $\tilde{L}''$ and $\tilde{L}'$ are the NLO taste-violating parameters in SU(3) rSxPT. Here I use the tilde to distinguish them from L'' and L' after redefinitions in Ref. [11]. Namely, in SU(3) rSxPT, L'' and L' are related to $\tilde{L}''$ and $\tilde{L}'$ through

$$\frac{1}{16\pi^2} (L'' - L') = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} (\tilde{L}'' - \tilde{L}') - (8L_5 + 24L_4) \Delta_{av}^{(2)}, \quad (65)$$

$$\frac{1}{16\pi^2} (L'' + L') = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} (\tilde{L}'' + \tilde{L}') - (32L_8 - 16L_5 + 96L_6 - 48L_4) \Delta_I^{(2)}. \quad (66)$$

Eqs. (61) and (62) are the same as the equations in the full QCD continuum case [2]. Eqs. (59) and (60) relate the unphysical LECs in the partially-quenched two-flavor theory to the physical LECs in the three-flavor theory. Eqs. (63) and (64) give us relations between taste-violating parameters in the two-flavor and three-flavor theories. If we require the SU(2) SxPT to describe the same physics in the two-flavor sector of the underlying SU(3) SxPT, all the parameters in the SU(2) theory should vary with the strange quark mass m_s according to Eqs. (59)-(64).

The renormalizations of $\tilde{L}''_{(2)}$ and $\tilde{L}'_{(2)}$ are complicated and involve the taste-splitting terms Δ_I and Δ_{av} . It is more convenient to redefine $\tilde{L}''_{(2)}$ and $\tilde{L}'_{(2)}$ by associating particular

$O(a^2)$ terms with the l_i [11]. The following replacements:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2f_{(2)}^2}(p_1)(m_u + m_d) &\rightarrow \frac{p_1}{2f_{(2)}^2}(\mu_{(2)}(m_u + m_d) + a^2\Delta_{av}^{(2)}), \\
\frac{\mu_{(2)}}{2f_{(2)}^2}(4l_4 - p_1)(m_x + m_y) &\rightarrow \frac{4l_4 - p_1}{2f_{(2)}^2}(\mu_{(2)}(m_x + m_y) + a^2\Delta_{av}^{(2)}), \\
\frac{\mu_{(2)}}{f_{(2)}^2}(4l_3 + p_1 + 4p_2)(m_u + m_d) &\rightarrow \frac{4l_3 + p_1 + 4p_2}{f_{(2)}^2}(\mu_{(2)}(m_u + m_d) + a^2\Delta_I^{(2)}), \\
\frac{\mu_{(2)}}{f_{(2)}^2}(-(p_1 + 4p_2))(m_x + m_y) &\rightarrow \frac{-(p_1 + 4p_2)}{f_{(2)}^2}(\mu_{(2)}(m_x + m_y) + a^2\Delta_I^{(2)})
\end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

absorb splittings into the mass-dependent counterterms to make them correspond to the meson masses (or average values thereof) that appear in the loops. Eq. (67) is equivalent to defining new parameters $L''_{(2)}$ and $L'_{(2)}$:

$$\frac{1}{16\pi^2}(L''_{(2)} - L'_{(2)}) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}(\tilde{L}''_{(2)} - \tilde{L}'_{(2)}) + 2l_4\Delta_{av}^{(2)}, \tag{68}$$

$$\frac{1}{16\pi^2}(L''_{(2)} + L'_{(2)}) = \frac{1}{16\pi^2}(\tilde{L}''_{(2)} + \tilde{L}'_{(2)}) - 4l_3\Delta_I^{(2)}. \tag{69}$$

After these redefinitions, $L''_{(2)}$ will become independent of chiral scale, and $L'_{(2)}$ is renormalized according to:

$$L'_{(2)}(\Lambda') = L'_{(2)}(\Lambda) + 2(\delta_V'^{(2)} + \delta_A'^{(2)}) \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2}. \tag{70}$$

The renormalizations of other LECs remain unchanged.

After these redefinitions, the new $L''_{(2)}$ and $L'_{(2)}$ are related to the corresponding SU(3) quantities L'' and L' by:

$$\begin{aligned}
L''_{(2)} - L'_{(2)} &= (L'' - L') - \Delta_{av}(1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) + 16\pi^2\Delta_{av}(8L_5 + 24L_4 - 2l_4) \\
&= (L'' - L') + \Delta_{av} \left[128\pi^2L_4 - \frac{1}{2}(1 + \log \frac{\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
L''_{(2)} + L'_{(2)} &= (L'' + L') - \frac{1}{3}\Delta_I(1 + \log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) + 16\pi^2\Delta_I(32L_8 - 16L_5 + 96L_6 - 48L_4 - 4l_3) \\
&= (L'' + L') + \Delta_I \left[16\pi^2(32L_6 - 16L_4) - \frac{2}{9}(1 + \log \frac{\frac{4}{3}\mu m_s}{\Lambda^2}) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

Using the standard scale renormalization of the L_i [2],

$$L_i(\Lambda') = L_i(\Lambda) + \frac{C_i}{256\pi^2} \log \frac{\Lambda'^2}{\Lambda^2} \tag{73}$$

with

$$C_4 = -1 ; \quad C_5 = -3 ; \quad (74)$$

$$2C_6 - C_4 = -2/9 ; \quad 2C_8 - C_5 = 4/3, \quad (75)$$

it is easy to check that the factors in square parenthesis in Eqs. (71) and (72) are scale independent. This is a consistency check, since $L''_{(2)}$ and $L'_{(2)}$ transform in the same way as L'' and L' , respectively, under scale change.

IV. REMARKS AND CONCLUSION

I calculated the pseudo-Goldstone pion mass and decay constant to NLO in two-flavor PQ-rS χ PT using the replica method. I also checked that SU(2) rS χ PT emerges from SU(3) rS χ PT in the limit $\frac{m_x}{m_s}, \frac{m_y}{m_s}, \frac{m_l}{m_s}, \frac{a^2 \Delta_B}{\mu m_s}, \frac{a^2 \delta'_{V(A)}}{\mu m_s} \ll 1$, as assumed in Ref. [9]. Finally, I derived the relations for the LECs and taste-violating parameters between the two-flavor and three-flavor cases. Some of the formulae here (Eqs. (47) and (48)) are used for the SU(2) chiral fits to MILC data [29].

At the present stage, we have MILC data for the light pseudoscalar mass and decay constant at five lattice spacings from 0.15 fm to 0.045 fm, generated with 2+1 flavors of asqtad improved staggered quarks. For each lattice spacing, we have many different sea quark masses as well as many different combinations of valence quark masses. For most ensembles, the strange quark mass is near its physical value, and the light sea quark masses are much smaller. If light valence quark masses and taste splittings are also taken significantly smaller than the strange quark mass, we expect that SU(2) rS χ PT would apply. Preliminary results indicate that it is indeed the case. Since the strange quark mass is close to the physical value in the ensembles used for the fits, the SU(2) LECs only suffer small changes due to variations in the strange quark mass. We can fit to lattice data using Eqs. (47) and (48) to get values of SU(2) LECs, the pion decay constant f_π , and the physical light quark mass $\hat{m}$, as well as the chiral condensate in the two-flavor chiral limit. Furthermore, we can do a systematic NNLO SU(2) chiral fit if continuum NNLO chiral logarithms [22] and possible analytic terms are included, and if taste-violations are relatively small. The results appear to be consistent with the results of the SU(3) analysis [29].

However, to make the formulae complete and results more accurate, it may be important

to incorporate the effects of the variations in the strange quark mass by doing appropriate adjustments on certain parameters in the two-flavor theory. In practice, for each strange quark mass, the four LECs l_3, l_4, p_1 and p_2 may be adjusted according to Eqs. (59)-(62), and the two taste-violating parameters, $L''_{(2)}$ and $L'_{(2)}$, may be adjusted according to Eq. (71) and Eq. (72). One then performs chiral fits to all the lattice data simultaneously. At the final step, physical values of LECs can be obtained by extrapolating to the physical strange quark mass.

An extension of the present work to the case of quantities involving the strange quark such as f_K or m_K^2 using the method of heavy kaon χ PT [4, 30] may be very useful. Work on that is in progress.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank C. Bernard for proposing this subject and for valuable advice along the way.

-
- [1] S. Weinberg, *Physica A* **96**, 327 (1979).
 - [2] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Nucl. Phys. B* **250**, 465 (1985).
 - [3] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Ann. Phys.* **158**, 142 (1984).
 - [4] C. Allton *et al.* [RBC-UKQCD Collaboration], *Phys. Rev.* **D78**, 114509 (2008) [arXiv:0804.0473].
 - [5] D. Kadoh *et al.* [PACS-CS Collaboration], arXiv:0810.0351.
 - [6] L. Lellouch, arXiv:0902.4545.
 - [7] C. Aubin and C. Bernard, *Phys. Rev.* **D68**, 034014 (2003) [hep-lat/0304014] and 074011 (2003) [hep-lat/0306026].
 - [8] W. Lee and S. Sharpe *Phys. Rev.* **D60**, 114503 (1999).
 - [9] C. Bernard, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 114503 (2006) [hep-lat/0603011].
 - [10] C. Bernard, M. Golterman, Y. Shamir, *Phys. Rev.* **D77**, 074505 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2560].
 - [11] C. Aubin *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 114501 (2004) [hep-lat/0407028].
 - [12] A. Bazavov *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], *PoS LAT2009*, 079 (2009) [arXiv:0910.3618].

- [13] S. Sharpe and R. Singleton, Jr, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **73**, 234-236 (1999) [hep-lat/9808047].
- [14] E. Follana *et al.* [HPQCD and UKQCD], Phys. Rev. **D75**, 054502 (2007) [hep-lat/0610092].
- [15] A. Bazavov *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], PoS **LAT2008**, 033 (2008) [arXiv:0903.0874].
- [16] C. Aubin and C. Bernard, Nucl. Phys. **B** (Proc. Suppl.) **124-130**, 182 (2004) [hep-lat/0308036].
- [17] C. Bernard and M. Golterman, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 853-857 (1992) [hep-lat/9204007].
- [18] C. Bernard and M. Golterman, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 486-494 (1994) [hep-lat/9306005].
- [19] P.H. Damgaard and K. Splittorff, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 054509 (2000) [hep-lat/0003017].
- [20] S. Sharpe and N. Shores, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 114510 (2001) [hep-lat/0108003].
- [21] S. Sharpe and R. Van de Water, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 114505 (2005) [hep-lat/0409018].
- [22] J. Bijnens and T.A. Lähde, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 074502 (2005) [hep-lat/0506004].
- [23] C. Bernard, M. Golterman and Y. Shamir, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 114511 (2006) [hep-lat/0604017].
- [24] Y. Shamir, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 034509 (2005) [hep-lat/0412014].
- [25] Y. Shamir, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 054503 (2007) [hep-lat/0607007].
- [26] A. Bazavov, *et al.*, arXiv:0903.3598, to appear in Rev. Mod. Phys.
- [27] C. Bernard, Phys. Rev. **D65**, 054031 (2002) [hep-lat/0111051].
- [28] J. Bijnens, G. Colangelo and G. Ecker, arXiv:hep-ph/9907333.
- [29] A. Bazavov *et al.* [MILC Collaboration], PoS **LAT2009**, 077 (2009).
- [30] A. Roessl, Nucl. Phys. **B555**, 507 (1999) [hep-ph/9904230].